

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/696,806	10/25/2000	Lisa M. Palmer	014208.1339	3178
5073 7.	590 05/18/2004		EXAMINER	
BAKER BOT	TTS L.L.P.		MCCLELLA	N, JAMES S
2001 ROSS AV SUITE 600	VENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 05/18/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/696,806	PALMER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		James S McClellan	3627			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	the correspondence address			
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS a. cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed D) days will be considered timely. From the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 A</u>	pril 2004.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) \(\times \) 5) \(\times \) 6) \(\times \) 7) \(\times \)	Claim(s) 1,4-12 and 15-22 is/are pending in the day Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,4-12 and 15-22 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) 🔲 -	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)[] / a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureate the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Appl rity documents have been rec u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage			
Attachment						
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ' No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 4, 2004 has been entered.

Amendment

2. Applicant's submittal of an amendment was entered on April 4, 2004, wherein: claims 1, 4-12, and 15-22 are pending and claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 4-12, and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. (hereinafter "Anderson et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,810 (hereinafter "Noble et al.").

Application/Control Number: 09/696,806

Art Unit: 3627

Regarding claim 1, Anderson et al. discloses a method for organizing vendor information comprising: receiving data comprising a plurality of accounts payable items, each accounts payable item having an associated vendor name (see column 12, line 63, "vendor name"), the vendor name representing a business associated with a purchase transaction represented by the accounts payable item, wherein ones of the accounts payable items are associated with a first inventor name; and associating a first vendor identifier (see column 12, line 64, "vendor identification number") and a second vendor identifier (see column 12, lines 64-66, "vendor type") using a computer with ones of the accounts payable items associated with the first vendor name; the first vendor identifier (see column 12, line 64, "vendor identification number") uniquely identifies a single vendor associated with the first vendor name; and the second vendor identifier (see column 12, lines 64-66, "vendor type") indicates a relationship between the first vendor and a second vendor; [claim 5] the first vendor identifier (see column 12, line 64, "vendor identification number") and second vendor identifier (see column 12, lines 64-66, "vendor type") are associated with ones of the items in response to the first vendor name; [claim 6] maintaining a database (see column 12, lines 53-58, "database 66") associating one or more vendor identifiers with the first vendor name; [claim 7] the database (see column 12, lines 53-58, "database 66") was at least partially created in response to a database describing relationships between a plurality of vendor names (vendors are associated by vendor type); [claim 8] the database was created at least partially in response to relationships between vendors defined by a user of computer software associated with the database (vendors are associated by vendor type); [claim 9] associating a plurality of vendor identifiers with a vendor group (vendors are associated by vendor type); and [claim 10] the vendor group comprises a plurality of vendors Application/Control Number: 09/696,806

Art Unit: 3627

with a common characteristic selected from the group consisting of an industry (see column 12, lines 65-66, "vendor type, e.g., gas, electric, telephone..."), a product, an ownership relationship, a strategic alliance, and a joint venture.

Regarding **claim 12**, Anderson et al. discloses a system for organizing vendor information as required by the method of claim 1 described above in detail. Dependent **claims 13-21** are similar to claims 2-10 as set forth above.

Regarding amendment to **claims 1 and 12**, Anderson et al. fails to disclose indicating an organizational business relationship.

Noble et al. teaches adding a vendor identifier that indicates the relationship between vendors based on a subsidiary (see column 11, lines 1-24), joint venture, partnership, or an ownership relationship.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anderson et al. with vendor identifier as taught by Noble et al., because distinguishing between subsidiaries allows an entity to better organize their databases with more specific information which allows more detailed analysis of the state of the entity.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 8, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6, third paragraph (continued through page 7), Applicant argues that Anderson et al. fails to anticipate claims 1 and 12 as currently amended. Applicant's argument is moot in

Application/Control Number: 09/696,806

Art Unit: 3627

view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment. Claims 1 and 12 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Anderson et al. in view of Noble et al.

On page 8, first full paragraph, Applicant argues that Nobel is not related to identifying vendor relationships in an accounts payable system. Applicant argues that Noble appears to teach a general ledger system that may be shared between subsidiaries of a corporation. The Examiner agrees. However, Noble states (column 10, lines 62-68) that the system may also be a accounts payable system as opposed to a general ledger. Noble provides the teaching of organizing the combined accounts payable system (column 10, lines 62-68) by the various subsidiaries of the organization. Therefore, in Noble's combined accounts payable system, each entry must identify the subsidiary associated with each entry and identification of the subsidiaries provides an organizational business relationship between the vendors (i.e. a subsidiary relationship).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/696,806

Art Unit: 3627

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jim McClellan whose telephone number is (703) 305-0212. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (Official communications) or (703) 746-3516 (Informal/Draft communications).

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.

James S. McClellan Primary Examiner A.U. 3627

jsm May 14, 2004